

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the present application as amended. Claims 1-40 remain in the application.

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-12, 14-26, 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wagner US Patent No. 5,742,845. Wagner discusses a method of permitting non-standard I/O devices to communicate through an open network system, such as the Internet, using HTTP, or a similar protocol. Wagner's method is directed at providing an extended open system protocol (such as HTTP) that provides the additional commands (such as PAYMENT) to permit the use of the system in transaction systems. (Wagner, Field of the Invention and Abstract.) However, in Wagner's system *communications sessions between the I/O devices coupled to the open network 14 and the web server 12 are generally conducted in the same fashion as Internet protocol communication sessions are currently performed, e.g., using HTTP or other open system protocols.* (Wagner, column 10, lines 26-29 and 47-51). The Examiner points to the Summary, at column 5, lines 48-67, regarding communication with the PDA in a native format. However, the references section of the Summary simply states "commands which are compatible with the communication schema of a presently-implemented protocol for the Internet are used and additions are made to commands implemented within the control structure of that existing protocol to support non-standard I/O device communication." Thus, the referenced section does not teach or suggest the use of a native PDA format. Wagner additionally discusses a non-standard I/O device linking to a web server, to perform a particular transaction.

Claim 1, on the other hand, recites:

A method of sending data from a communication station, the method comprising:
receiving semi-structured data from a personal digital assistant (PDA) in a format native to the PDA;

parsing the semi-structured data to identify a type of the semi-structured data;
 if the semi-structured data is destination data, sending the data to a destination indicated by the semi-structured data.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wagner does not teach or suggest receiving semi-structured data in a format native to a PDA, nor does Wagner teach or suggest that semi-structured data could be destination data. As noted above, Wagner explicitly teaches away from using a native PDA format. That is, Wagner states, "the protocol used to transport data messages between Web server 12 and the I/O devices coupled to the open network 14 is the Hyper Text Transport Protocol (HTTP), although other open system protocols utilized on the Internet may be used." (Wagner, column 10, lines 47-51). The native format of the PDA is not HTTP, and thus Wagner teaches away from receiving data in a format native to the PDA.

Furthermore, Wagner does not teach or suggest that part of the data retrieved from the semi-structured data is destination data. Rather, Wagner notes that the I/O device provides a destination for its queries in the HTML format, directed at a particular Web address. Thus, if destination (e.g. host) information is received from the I/O device, it is received as a structured HTML query. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by or obvious in view of Wagner.

Claims 2-14 depend on claim 1, and incorporate its limitations. Therefore, claims 2-14 are not anticipated by or obvious over Wagner for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1.

Similarly, claim 15 recites:

 An apparatus for sending data from a communication station, the apparatus comprising:
 a communication interface to receive semi-structured data from a personal digital assistant (PDA) in a format native to the PDA;

a parser to parse the semi-structured data and to identify a type of the semi-structured data;
a data structuring logic for generating a structured data from the semi-structured data; and
a sending logic for receiving the structured data and sending appropriate data to a destination indicated by the structured data.

As noted above, Wagner does not teach or suggest receiving semi-structured data in a PDA-native format. } Furthermore, as noted above, Wagner does not teach or suggest that a destination may be indicated by the semi-structured data, which is parsed into structured data. It is well known that HTML is considered structured data, and that HTTP is a protocol, which inherently is considered structured. Therefore, the destination data in Wagner, which is provided as an HTML command, cannot be considered data received in the PDA native format. Therefore, claim 15, and claims 16-29 which depend on it, are not anticipated by or obvious in view of Wagner.

Examiner rejected claims 30 – 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kumpf, U.S. Patent No. 5,6412,022. Kumpf describes a network multifunction peripheral server permits simultaneous processing of print and scan jobs from one or more networked clients. Kumpf describes a server that is connectable to a network port and a multifunction peripheral that has print and scan functions. Kumpf does not mention the use of a personal digital assistant (PDA). Rather, the only data source that Kumpf discusses is "client 12, typically a PC." (Kumpf, column 3, line 41). The Examiner points to column 5, lines 47-63 and column 6, lines 8-27. However, the referenced sections only discuss the use of the scan channel. Those sections do not mention PDAs in any form. Furthermore, Kumpf does not teach or suggest the use of "semi-structured data" or parsing of the same. Rather, Kumpf addresses the issues of print and scan dataflows, and the prevention of conflicts between the same. There is no mention of semi-structured data.

Claim 30 recites:

A method of sending data from a communication station, the method comprising:
receiving semi-structured data from a personal digital assistant (PDA) in a format native to the PDA;
parsing the semi-structured data to identify a type of the semi-structured data;
acting on data in the manner indicated by the semi-structured data and a user; and
returning a confirmation receipt to the PDA in a format native to the PDA, the confirmation receipt including a unique identification (ID).

As noted above, Kumpf does not teach or suggest the use of a PDA, nor the receipt and parsing of semi-structured data. Therefore, for the same reasons given above, claim 30, and claims 31-33 which depend on it, are not anticipated by or obvious in view of Kumpf.

Claim 34 recites:

A system comprising:
a personal digital assistant (PDA);
a communications appliance coupled to a network;
a memory for storing a unique job identification (job ID) for each job handled by the communications appliance.
the communications appliance comprising:
a communication interface to receive semi-structured data from the PDA;
a parser to parse the semi-structured data and to identify a type of the semi-structured data;
a sending logic for handing data based on the semi-structured data received from the PDA; and
the communication interface for returning the job ID to the PDA.

As noted above, Kumpf does not teach or suggest the use of a PDA. Furthermore, Kumpf does not teach or suggest storing a unique job identification. The Examiner refers to column 5, lines 45-67. However, the cited section does not teach, mention, or discuss the use of a unique job ID. Therefore, claim 30, and claims 35-40 which depend on it, are not anticipated by or obvious over Kumpf.

Examiner rejected claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner US patent No. 5,742,845 in view of Kikinis US Patent No. 5,692,199. Claims 2 and 6 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, and therefore incorporate its limitations.

As noted above, Wagner does not teach or suggest receiving semi-structured data from a PDA in the PDA's native format, nor sending a job to a destination indicated by the semi-structured data. Kikinis does not cure these shortcomings of Wagner.

Kikinis discusses a personal digital assistant module with a local CPU, memory, and I/O interface, which has a host interface comprising a bus connected to the local CPU and a connector at a surface of the personal digital assistant for interfacing to a bus connector of a host general-purpose computer.

Kikinis cannot be logically combined with Wagner, since it addresses a different problem. Kikinis is directed toward a PDA's permanent connection with a computer system. Wagner, on the other hand, is directed toward using non-standard I/O devices, and permitting them to communicate using an extended version of the HTTP protocol. There is no suggestion either in Wagner or in Kikinis for the combination proposed by the Examiner. Since Wagner does not discuss the use of PDAs, and since Kikinis discusses only the use of PDAs with a computer system, the combination is illogical.

Furthermore, even in combination, the references do not make the present invention obvious. Specifically, neither Wagner nor Kikinis teach or suggest receiving semi-structured data from a PDA in the PDA's native format, nor sending a job to a destination indicated by the semi-structured data. As noted above, Wagner does not discuss the use of PDAs or semi-structured data. Similarly, Kikinis does not address the communications format between the PDA and the computer system, nor does

Kikinis teach or suggest extracting destination information from the semi-structured data. Therefore, claims 2 and 6 are not obvious over Wagner in view of Kikinis.

Examiner rejected claims 13 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner US patent No. 5,742,854 in view of Vaudreuil US Patent No. 5,740,230. Claim 13 depends on claim 1, and therefore incorporates its limitations. As noted above, Wagner does not teach or suggest receiving semi-structured data from a PDA in the PDA's native format, nor sending a job to a destination indicated by the semi-structured data. Vaudreuil does not cure these shortcomings of Wagner.

Vaudreuil discusses a network multifunction peripheral device, which permits simultaneous processing of print and scan jobs from networked clients. Vaudreuil discusses the use of various messaging systems, such as email, voicemail, electronic mail, video transmission facilities, or other data transmission or receipt facilities. However, Vaudreuil never teaches or suggests the use of a personal digital assistant (PDA), in any way. In fact, Vaudreuil never mentions anything that is not explicitly a messaging system. Furthermore, Vaudreuil does not address the use of semi-structured data. Rather, Vaudreuil explicitly uses messaging systems, which use addressing mechanisms that are structured.

Therefore, Wagner in view of Vaudreuil do not make claim 13 obvious. Similarly, claim 27 depends on claim 15, and incorporates its limitations. Therefore, claim 27 is not obvious over Wagner in view of Vaudreuil.

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Judith A. Szepesi at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1/17/03


Judith A. Szepesi
Reg. No, 39,393

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300